

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed January 30, 2008. Claims 1-27 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-27 were rejected. Claims 1-27 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

DOUBLE PATENTING

The Examiner rejected Claim 1 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over Claim 1 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/808,036 (hereinafter "the 10/808,036 Application"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Applicant respectfully reminds the Examiner that for an obviousness-type double patenting rejecting, the disclosure of the co-pending application may not be used as prior art against the claims of the instant application. See M.P.E.P. § 804(II)(B)(1). However, given that the above-referenced double patenting rejection is provisional, Applicant respectfully submits that upon the allowance/issuance of either the instant Application or the 10/808,036 Application, Applicant will address any non-provisional double patenting rejection, if any, at that time.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 4, 13, 19 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,202,211 issued to Williams, Jr. (hereinafter "*Williams, Jr.*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0048757 issued to Accarie et al. (hereinafter "*Accarie*") in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/004797 issued to Salmonsén (hereinafter "*Salmonsén*"). Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14-18 and 25-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Williams, Jr.* in view of *Accarie* in view of *Salmonsén* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0056118 issued to Hunter et al. (hereinafter "*Hunter*"). Claims 8, 9, 10, 20-22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Williams, Jr.* in view of *Accarie* in view of *Salmonsén* and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0019908 issued to Williams et al. (hereinafter "*Chris Williams*"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 13 and 23 are independent. Applicant respectfully submits that the references, even if combined, fail to disclose, teach or suggest the limitations recited by Claims 1, 13 and 23. For example, Claim 1 recites "a centralized storage system adapted to communicatively receive a plurality of source components." In the Office Action, the Examiner appears to rely on the server 20 of *Williams, Jr.* as corresponding to the "centralized storage system" recited by Claim 1, and the Examiner appears to rely on the mass storage device 34 of *Williams, Jr.* as corresponding to the "plurality of source components" communicatively received by the "centralized storage system" recited by Claim 1 (Office Action, page 5). Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Williams, Jr.* appears to disclose that the mass storage device 34 may be any suitable device for storing large volumes of data, such as a magnetic disk or tape, magneto-optical (MO) storage device, or any of various types of Digital Versatile Disk (DVD) or Compact Disk (CD) storage (*Williams, Jr.*, column 5, lines 30-40). *Williams, Jr.* does not appear to disclose or even suggest that a "plurality" of such mass storage devices are disposed in the server 20 of *Williams, Jr.* To the contrary, *Williams, Jr.* appears to indicate that only a single mass storage device is located in the server 20 because such device, alone, is capable of "storing large volumes of data." Neither *Accarie* nor *Salmonsens* remedy at least this deficiency of *Williams, Jr.* Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Further, the Examiner appears to consider the set top box 22 of *Williams, Jr.* as corresponding to the "sink" recited by Claim 1, and the Examiner appears to assert that *Williams, Jr.* teaches that the set top box 22 of *Williams, Jr.* enables a user to select an A/V interface associated with at least one of the plurality of source components (Office action, page 6). Applicant respectfully disagrees. The portion of *Williams, Jr.* relied on by the Examiner recites:

The set top box 22 also has a coaxial cable input 59 for receiving signals from a cable TV converter box 51, which receives standard cable TV signals as input and outputs a tuned TV signal to the set top box 22 on channel 3 or 4. If the appropriate mode is selected, the set top box 22 provides the tuned TV signal to TV 23, such that a user can view standard television programming on the TV 23. In the illustrated embodiment, the channel setting for the cable box 51 is controlled by the set-top box 22 using IR link 46. The cable box 51 may also be controlled by a handheld IR,

RF or other similar remote control device, which may be the same device used to control the set top box 22.

(*Williams, Jr.*, column 6, lines 43-53). The above-referenced portion of *Williams, Jr.* appears to be directed toward controlling a channel setting for the cable box 51 of *Williams, Jr.* However, the cable box 51 of *Williams, Jr.* is neither located in nor forms part of the server 20 of *Williams, Jr.*, which the Examiner relies on to correspond to the “centralized storage system” having a “plurality of source components.” Therefore, neither the portion relied on by the Examiner nor any other portion of *Williams, Jr.* appears to disclose or even suggest the above-referenced limitation of Claim 1. Additionally, neither *Accarie* nor *Salmonsens* appears to remedy at least this deficiency of *Williams, Jr.*

Moreover, the Examiner appears to assert that the set top box 22 of *Williams, Jr.* controls the display of a menu interface of the source component on a presentation device (Office Action, page 6). Applicant respectfully disagrees. As discussed above, the Examiner appears to consider the server 20 of *Williams, Jr.* as corresponding to the “centralized storage system” recited by Claim 1, and the Examiner appears to consider the TV of *Williams, Jr.* as corresponding to the “presentation device” recited by Claim 1 (Office Action, pages 5 and 6). *Williams, Jr.* does not appear to disclose or even suggest that the IR or remote control device of *Williams, Jr.* is used to control or enable selection of any interface, much less a menu interface, of either the server 20 or the mass storage device 34 of the server 20 of *Williams, Jr.* Therefore, neither the portion relied on by the Examiner nor any other portion of *Williams, Jr.* appears to disclose or even suggest the above-referenced limitation of Claim 1. Additionally, neither *Accarie* nor *Salmonsens* appears to remedy at least this deficiency of *Williams, Jr.*

The Examiner appears to acknowledge that neither *Williams, Jr.* nor *Accarie* teach the streaming of an A/V menu interface (Office Action, page 6). However, the Examiner appears to assert that *Salmonsens* remedies this deficiency (Office Action, page 6). Applicant respectfully disagrees. *Salmonsens* appears to disclose, and the Examiner appears to rely on, a transcoder 530 and a virtual content renderer 540 of *Salmonsens* such that the transcoder 530 of *Salmonsens* converts MPEG into video object block (VOB) files (*Salmonsens*, paragraph 0105). However, the transcoder 530 and virtual content renderer 540 of *Salmonsens* appear to reside on the server 500 of *Salmonsens* where the content appears to also reside (*Salmonsens*, figure 5). In contrast, Claim 1 recites “a sink component disposed remote from the storage system”

(emphasis added). Thus, even if combined, the cited combination fails to disclose the limitations recited by Claim 1.

Further, even if combined as proposed by the Examiner, the set top box 22 of *Williams, Jr.* that the Examiner considers to correspond to the "sink component" recited by Claim 1 would not enable selection of an A/V menu interface "to display" on the presentation device as recited by Claim 1. To the contrary, even if combined as proposed by the Examiner, the cited references do not appear to disclose that a user can "select an A/V menu interface . . . to display" on the presentation device as recited by Claim 1. The Examiner appears to rely on *Accarie* to disclose that a menu interface is displayed so that a user may interact with or make a selection from the displayed interface (Office Action, page 6). However, neither *Accarie* nor the other cited references appear to disclose a sink component that enables a user to select the A/V menu interface "to be displayed" on the presentation device as recited by Claim 1 (emphasis added). To the contrary, any purported menu interface relied on by the Examiner in the cited references appears to already be displayed such that any action performed using the set top box 22 of *Williams, Jr.* would be to interact with an already-displayed menu interface.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Independent Claim 13 recites "remotely accessing, via a sink component, a centralized storage system having a plurality of source components" and "receiving, via the sink component, a user selection of at least one of the plurality of source components for displaying an A/V menu interface associated with the selected source component on the presentation device, the sink component controlling streaming of the selected A/V menu interface from the corresponding source component to the presentation device" (emphasis added). Independent Claim 23 recites "means for remotely accessing, via a sink component, a centralized storage system adapted to communicatively receive a plurality of source components" and "means, via the sink component, for receiving a user selection of at least one of the plurality of source components for displaying an A/V menu interface associated with the selected source component on the presentation device" and "controlling streaming of the selected A/V menu interface from the corresponding source component to the presentation device" (emphasis added). At least for the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1,

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 13 and 23 are also patentable over the cited references.

Claims 2-12, 14-22 and 24-27 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1, 13 and 23 are also patentable over the cited references at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1, 13 and 23 and also add additional elements that further distinguish the cited references. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 1-27 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicant has overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: James L. Baudino
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: March 4, 2008